

200314101-1

10/701,885

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Official Action mailed August 31, 2007. Reconsideration of the application in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status:

Claims 31-67 were withdrawn from consideration under a previous Restriction Requirement and cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 10, 14, 16, 69 and 70 have also been cancelled previously without prejudice or disclaimer.

By the present paper, rejected claims 68, 71-79 and 81 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Thus, claims 1-9, 11-13, 15, 17-30, 80 and 82 are currently pending for further action.

Allowable Subject Matter:

In the final Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 1-9, 11-13, 15 and 17-30. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance of these claims.

The Examiner also indicated the presence of allowable subject matter in claims 80 and 82. Again, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this identification of allowable subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant proposes by the present paper to amend claims 80 and 82, rewriting each as an independent claim as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, following entry of the present amendment, claims 80 and 82 should be in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully request.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****OCT 19 2007**

10/701,885

200314101-1

Prior Art:

Claims 68 and 71-89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combined teachings of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/00145088 to Patel et al. ("Patel") and U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2004/0099983 to Dirscherl.

Claim 81 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the teachings of Patel taken alone.

Both of these rejections are rendered moot by the cancellation herein of all the rejected claims. Consequently, following entry of the present amendment, this application should be in condition for allowance.

Conclusion:

Entry and consideration of this amendment are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 for at least the following reasons. The present amendment makes only those changes necessary to place the application in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner. The amendment does not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration. And, based on the indications of the Examiner, the present amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of the present amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 116 and is hereby requested.

200314101-1

10/701,885

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is thought to be clearly in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application in light of these remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: October 19, 2007




Steven L. Nichols
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.
Managing Partner, Utah Office
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC
River Park Corporate Center One
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066
(801) 572-7666 (fax)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office
central facsimile number 571-273-8300 on October 19, 2007. Number of Pages: 14


Rebecca R. Schow